

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-8 have been allowed; claims 9-13 and 15-20 have been rejected and claim 14 has been objected to as dependent upon a rejected claim but including allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 9 and 14 have been amended to provide clear antecedent basis to the "determined user authorization method." Claim 9 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 to recite that some user authorization methods have "different associated security levels than others," while claim 11 has been amended to recite "authorizing a change from the first password to a second other password for securing the plurality of files." Support for the change to claim 11 may be found in Figure 7. No new matter has been entered by these changes.

### Claims 9-10

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over He (USP 5,944,824) in view of Brown et al. (US 6,618,806). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 relates to a method of providing improved security for files accessible by password data entry by, *inter alia*:

determining a user authorization method having an associated security level sufficient for accessing the secure password identifier, some user authorization methods having different associated security levels than others;

authorizing an individual according to the determined user authorization method; and

when the individual is authorized, retrieving the secure password from the password database and automatically providing the secure password to a selected secured file password entry subsystem.

Such a method is not contemplated by He or Brown et al. As acknowledged by the Examiner, He does not teach determining a user authorization method having an associated security level sufficient for accessing the secure password identifier or authorizing an individual according to the determined user authentication method. For such a teaching, the Examiner cites Brown et al. However, Brown et al. also do not teach determining a user

authorization method having an associated security level sufficient for accessing the secure password identifier as claimed. In particular, Brown et al. do not teach that "some user authorization methods having different associated security levels than others." Accordingly, even if the teachings of Brown et al. could have been combined with the teachings of He by one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made (for which there is no suggestion or motivation), the claimed invention would not have resulted. He and Brown et al. thus do not render the invention of independent claims 9 and 10 (dependent upon claim 9) obvious to one skilled in the art and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 10 as being obvious in view of the teachings of He and Brown et al. is thus appropriate and respectfully requested.

*Claims 11 and 15-19*

Claims 11 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Nielsen (USP 6,182,229). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 11 relates to a method of changing a first password for securing files accessible by password data entry to a second other password. Such a method includes:

- determining a plurality of files secured with the first password;
- authorizing a change from the first password to a second other password for securing the plurality of files;
- for each file secured with the first password, accessing the file with the first password and securing the file with the second other password; and,
- storing the second other password in a password database.

Such a method is not taught by Nielsen. Nielsen does not contemplate a method of changing or updating passwords as claimed. On the contrary, Nielsen discloses a system in which a "master password" may be provided by a user to access a database of passwords that identifies the secure file or other secure information on a different computer and determines the correct associated password for the secure information on the different computer. Even if the "master password" used by Nielsen may be deemed to correspond to the claimed "second password" as noted by the Examiner, Applicant notes that Nielsen clearly does not teach "authorizing a change from the first password to a second other password for securing the plurality of files" as claimed. In other words, Nielsen clearly does not teach changing the password stored in the password database from the first password to the master password. Those skilled in the art would appreciate that this would make no sense as it would make the

system less secure rather than more secure. Thus, the "master password" taught by Nielsen clearly does not correspond to the claimed "second other password" and Nielsen clearly does not teach the claimed method of changing passwords. Accordingly, Nielsen does not anticipate the method of claim 11 or any of the claims dependent thereon and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 11 and dependent claims 15-19 as being anticipated by Nielsen is thus appropriate and respectfully requested.

*Claims 12, 13, and 20*

Claims 12, 13, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Nielsen in view of Bellemore et al. (US 6,145,086). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 12, 13, and 20, the Examiner alleges that Bellemore et al. teach archiving the old password being changed, authorizing an individual requesting the change of the password prior to changing of the password, and automatically repeating the password change upon detection of a password breach or expiry of the password. Applicant submits that Bellemore et al. do not teach or suggest the shortcomings in Nielsen noted above with respect to independent claim 11; accordingly, the teachings of Bellemore et al. are not believed to be particularly relevant to the invention of independent claim 11 from which claims 12, 13 and 20 respectively depend. Claims 12, 13, and 20 are thus believed to be allowable for the same reasons as given above with respect to independent claim 11. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12, 13 and 20 is thus appropriate and respectfully requested.

*Allowable claims 1-8 and 14*

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 1-8 are allowed and that claim 14 contains allowable subject matter. In view of the allowability of claim 11 as expressed above, claim 14 has not been placed in independent form. Applicant reserves the right to do so at a later time as appropriate.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 9 and 10 as allegedly being obvious over He and Brown et al., of claims 11 and 15-19 as allegedly being anticipated by Nielsen, and of claims 12, 13, and 20 as allegedly being obvious over Nielsen in view of Bellemore et al. is respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** IVPH-0041/12-52 US  
**Application No.:** 09/625,547  
**Office Action Dated:** May 20, 2005

**PATENT**

The present response is believed to obviate all rejections and objections of record. Withdrawal of all rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully requested.

Date: October 20, 2005



---

Michael P. Dunnam  
Registration No. 32,611

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439